

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/670,259	09/26/2003	Mark Darrell Varvel	S-98,065	5311	
31970 75	90 · 02/07/2005		EXAMINER		
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY			KRECK,	KRECK, JOHN J	
	IDENCE AVENUE, S.W. (CHI), MS 6F-067		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
	N, DC 20585-0162		3673		
			DATE MAILED: 02/07/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	1	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
0/		10/670,259	VARVEL, MARK DARRELL			
Office Action Su	mmary	xaminer	Art Unit			
`		lohn Kreck	3673			
The MAILING DATE of t Period for Reply	his communication appea	rs on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS - Extensions of time may be available und after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing - If the period for reply specified above is - If NO period for reply is specified above, - Failure to reply within the set or extende	COMMUNICATION. er the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a date of this communication. ess than thirty (30) days, a reply wi the maximum statutory period will a d period for reply will, by statute, ca in three months after the mailing da	a). In no event, however, may a reply be time thin the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from use the application to become ABANDONEI te of this communication, even if timely filed	ely filed swill be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) Responsive to commun	cation(s) filed on .					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL .		ction is non-final.				
· · ·						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pen 4a) Of the above claim(s 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are al 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3,4,8-13 and</u> 7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>2,5-7 and 14-1</u> 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subj) is/are withdrawn lowed. <u>18-30</u> is/are rejected. 7 is/are objected to.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is object	cted to by the Examiner.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request	that any objection to the dra	awing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing she	• •	n is required if the drawing(s) is obj niner. Note the attached Office				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•					
2. Certified copies o3. Copies of the cert application from the	None of: the priority documents if the priority documents if the priority documents if ified copies of the priority ne International Bureau (nave been received. nave been received in Applicati v documents have been receive	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)		·	·			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-89) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draftsperson's Patent Draftsperson)2)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	(PTO-413)			
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra Information Disclosure Statement(s) Paper No(s)/Mail Date			atent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/670,259 Page 2

Art Unit: 3673

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. It is noted that applicant has claimed a "passive" soil vapor extraction system; however applicant has disclosed and claimed a solar powered turbine; which apparently contradicts applicant's definition of passive (e.g. page 4, line 20: "utilizes ambient meteorological conditions in place of electrical..." A solar powered turbine is understood to be electrical in nature. For examination purposes; the claims are not considered to be limited to purely "passive" systems.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 20 and 21 recite the limitation "the horizontal conduit" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 3673

1. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hobby (U.S. Patent number 5,246,309).

Hobby shows the system including deep well (5); injection well (6); transfer conduit ('A'—between 5 and 6); and extraction well (1) as called for in claim 30.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9-13, 18-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beard, et al. (U.S. Patent number 5,584,605) in view of Gardner, et al. (U.S. Patent number 5,791,825—cited by applicant).

Beard teaches a system including a deep well (1); injection well (11); transfer conduit (between 19 and 9); and extraction well (7). Beard fails to teach the means for preventing migration.

Gardner teaches a means for prevent migration creating a boundary; and teaches that the boundary is advantageous to prevent spread of contaminants.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the Beard system to have included means for preventing migration as called for in claim 1; to prevent spread of contaminants.

Application/Control Number: 10/670,259

Art Unit: 3673

With regards to claims 3 and 4; Beard teaches the wells in the contaminated zone; thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have located those wells within a boundary, since those wells are meant for treating the contaminated zone.

Gardner teaches the barrier as called for in claim 8.

Gardner teaches the barrier covering the land surface as called for in claim 9.

With regards to claim 10: Beard shows the turbine attached to the top of the well.

Official notice is taken of the fact that it is well known to use solar power to power such devices, for example, where distances to power mains is great. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the Beard system to have solar power.

Beard teaches the branched conduit as called for in claim 11.

With regards to claims 12 and 13; Beard shows joints and teaches the conduits for transfer of air. Official notice is taken of the fact that it is well known to create air tight joints in conduits for air transfer; thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have made the joints air-tight.

Beard teaches the well in the waste zone as called for in claim 18.

Beard teaches the extraction well equal to the depth of the contaminants as called for in claim 19.

Beard teaches the deep well conduit (11) coupled to the horizontal (transfer?) conduit as called for in claim 20.

Beard teaches the injection conduit (1) coupled to the horizontal (transfer?) conduit as called for in claim 21.

With regards to claim 22: Official notice is taken of the fact that it is well known to make such conduits from ABS, PVC, or steel; since these materials are widely available and durable; thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have made the conduit from ABS, PVC, or steel.

Beard teaches the extraction conduit as called for in claim 23.

With regards to claim 24: Official notice is taken of the fact that it is well known to make such conduits from ABS, PVC, or steel; since these materials are widely available and durable; thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have made the conduit from ABS, PVC, or steel.

With regards to claim 25: Official notice is taken of the fact that it is well known to make such conduits from ABS, PVC, or steel; since these materials are widely available and durable; thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have made the conduit from ABS, PVC, or steel.

Beard teaches the injection wells surrounding (each) single extraction well as called for in claim 26.

Beard teaches the extraction wells surrounding (a) single injection well as called for in claim 27.

With regards to claim 28; it is apparent that the deep well of Beard could be used as a monitoring well.

Application/Control Number: 10/670,259 Page 6

Art Unit: 3673

With regards to claim 29; it is apparent that the extraction well of Beard could be used as a monitoring well.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 4. Claims 2, 5-7, 14-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Bernhardt (U.S. Patent number 5,346,330) teaches a liquid extraction system with similar well configuration; Basile, et al. (U.S. Patent number 5,279,740); Meo, III (U.S. Patent number 5,360,067); Bastian, et al. (U.S. Patent number 4,745,850); Graves, et al. (U.S. Patent number 5,178,491); and Billings (U.S. Patent number 5,277,518) teach similar vapor extraction systems.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Kreck whose telephone number is (703)308-2725. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 5:30 am - 2:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Shackelford can be reached on (703)308-2978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John Kreck Éxaminer Art Unit 3673